

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the separator comprises the polymer material-containing layer having the polymer material migration preventing layer provided thereon, and that the polymer material migration preventing is provided on the side of the polymer material-containing layer that faces the adhesive layer.

Further, claim 25 has been amended to be dependent on claim 10 instead of canceled claim 24, and to recite that a release agent is further provided on the polymer material-containing layer of the separator, and claim 26 has been amended accordingly to recite “the release agent” instead of “a release agent.”

Support for the amendments is found in the original application, in particular in paragraph [0030], page 17 of the original specification.

Claims 1-16, 19, 21-23 and 25-26 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 1, 9 and 10, claims 2 and 21 dependent on claim 1, claim 23 dependent on claim 9, and claims 11-14, 19 and 25-26 dependent directly or indirectly on claim 10, are directed to a polarizing member. Claim 3 dependent on claim 1, and claims 4-6 and 22 dependent on claim 3, are directed to an optical member. Claims 7 and 8 dependent on claims 1 and 3, respectively, and claims 15-16 dependent on claim 7, are directed to a liquid crystal display.

In the Office Action, claims 25-26 are objected to as improperly dependent on cancelled claim 24.

Claim 25 has been corrected to be dependent on claim 10 instead of cancelled claim 24. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 10, 12, 14, 19, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as obvious over US 5,880,800 to Mikura et al. ("Mikura"), and claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mikura in view of US 6,153,272 to Kim et al. ("Kim").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. The passage at col. 11, lines 40-45 of Mikura, to which reference is made in the Office Action, only discloses a "silicone series releasing agent" provided on the surface of a separator. However, the silicone release agent of Mikura is a conventional release layer and not a polymer material migration preventing layer. Specifically, the silicone release layer of Mikura conventionally provides the easy-release property to the separator, but does not prevent migration of material from the separator into the adhesive layer.

In contrast, in the polarizing member of present claim 10, the separator comprises a polymer material-containing layer having a polymer material migration preventing layer provided thereon, wherein the polymer material migration preventing is provided on the side of the polymer material-containing layer that faces the adhesive layer, as recited in present claim 10. An advantage of the polymer material migration preventing layer is that this layer prevents polymer material from migrating from the polymer material-containing layer into the adhesive, which is not the case with the conventional silicone release layer of Mikura. Therefore, present claim 10, and the claims dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are not obvious over Mikura taken alone or in any combination with Kim.

In particular, with respect to claims 12-13, it is submitted that Mikura is completely silent regarding silica or metal-oxide. Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, present claims 12-13 are not obvious over Mikura taken alone or in any combination with Kim.

In addition, with respect to claims 25-26, it is submitted that Mikura discloses only a

Serial Number: 09/929,063

Group Art Unit: 2812

conventional silicone release layer in a separator, so that it is completely silent as to providing (i) a polymer material migration preventing layer and (ii) a release agent, as recited in present claim 25, or (i) a polymer material migration preventing layer and (ii) a surface coat made of the release agent, as recited in present claim 26. Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, present claims 25-26 are not obvious over Mikura taken alone or in any combination with Kim.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,373

**Atty. Docket No. 020527**

**Customer No.: 38834**

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep